



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE NEW KNOW-NOTHINGISM AND THE OLD.

---

THE Know-Nothing party of a generation ago, growing out of a secret society, said to have been so-called because of the affectation of ignorance on the part of its members when questioned as to the society and its objects, had for its mainspring hostility to the influence of foreign-born citizens in our American politics, and particularly a bitter enmity, very similar to that of the Orangemen in Ireland and Canada, toward the adherents of the Catholic church. The alleged justification of this hostility was the danger to our American liberties and institutions likely to arise from this foreign influence, and especially from what was considered a foreign religion, the supreme head of which was in reality a foreigner, an Italian, living 4,000 miles from our country—and, what made it worse, a king ruling with despotic authority, commanding an army and navy, and treating with this country, as well as with the monarchies of Europe, as an equal sovereign power. The Know-Nothings conjured up direful visions of menace to our institutions from an armed invasion of this foreign king and his foreign allies, with the object of suppressing our hated democratic liberties and institutions. They imagined and asserted that the Catholics of this country were bound, as Catholics, to hold that they owed primary allegiance to this foreign potentate, and that they would feel obliged by their religious obligations to the Pope to take sides with him in any such conflict,—not merely not to serve against him, but to give him every aid and comfort in their power, even to the extent of taking up parricidal arms in his behalf against their country. They held that Roman Catholics, even in politics, must be papists first and Americans afterwards, if at all, and that they were, therefore, unworthy of American citizenship, unfit to be trusted with the sacred responsibility of the ballot, and still less worthy to hold any public office of trust or emolument. The hostility to foreigners who were not Catholics

was defended on the ground that they had not, and in most cases could not be reasonably expected to have, that knowledge of American institutions, their growth and history, and that love for them, which come, as a matter of course, to those of the elder American stock. It was felt that foreign-born citizens, in spite of their renunciation of all foreign allegiance, must necessarily be filled with the habits of thought, the prejudices and the traditions of the lands they had left, and more concerned about the good or evil fortune of these than about that of their adopted country. And therefore was it that even with regard to non-Catholic foreign-born citizens the Know-Nothings maintained the maxim, "Put none but Americans on guard!" which maxim bore, in their view, with double force on the unfortunate foreign Catholics, who were considered twice foreign, since to the disadvantages of their nativity they added the much more serious one of, as it was supposed, a blind and absolute obedience, from religious motives, to a foreign power.

To us of this generation it must appear that the fears, if they were honest, of the Know-Nothings, for the immediate future of America, were ludicrously exaggerated. The proportion of foreign-born people and of Catholics to the people of old American and non-Catholic stock was then much less than it is to-day, and the importance of foreign-born citizens and Catholics in their influence on politics, and in the number, dignity and power of the offices held by them, was quite as disproportionate. We may well surmise that a large part of the zeal of the Know-Nothings of that day was prompted by an insensate and vulgar theological hatred, precisely of the kind that still makes Orangemen and Catholics beat and kill one another year after year in Ireland, and again was largely stimulated by base selfishness and envy in the matter of a few wretched political offices then held by Catholics and foreigners, not very often rising higher than tide-waiterships and similar positions. The Roman Catholics of that day were evidently so conscious of their comparative fewness, and their utter inability to do, if they would, the dire things charged to them in intention, that, fearful of religious broils in which they could, as a rule, be only the victims, they made haste to disclaim with the greatest vehemence the evil designs and possibilities attributed to them, and more than one distinguished churchman said that, if necessary, they

would themselves take up arms to meet the papal invader on the shore, and to repel him with as much vigor as if he were but an ordinary foreign enemy. The late Archbishop Hughes, to correct these impressions and to refute these charges, loved to quote the example of the republic of Venice, waging vigorous war against the soldiers of the Pope to defend her interests and her political rights, while acknowledging the authority of the Pope in spirituals, and agreeing with him entirely in religion. Catholics, both lay and cleric, went out of their way to demonstrate their love of American institutions, and their pride in American citizenship. Bishops positively forbade that they should be addressed by the title of "lord" and "lordship," common in European countries, and nearly all the bishops and priests forbore to obtrude on the public their dignity or their profession, by those distinctions in dress which are now (to the great annoyance of the more American-minded among them) actually made mandatory, by the statutes and decrees of their synods and councils. For similar reasons all foreign-born citizens, whether Catholic or non-Catholic, were eager to assimilate themselves to the common American type, to learn, if they did not already know, the common language of our country, and, from choice as well as necessity, they merged their foreign nationality, and rapidly became Americans.

There were not then, as now, in our great cities, and in whole quarters of the agricultural districts of great states, vast agglomerations of men of one foreign nationality, preserving almost entire their manners, language, and traditions, and by virtue of their numbers making even the public schools in many places use a foreign tongue as the common vehicle of instruction, and producing the strange spectacle of native Americans of some totally different stock actually taking on the speech and characteristics of other nationalities. Thirty years ago there was no thought of what to-day is with many of our foreign-born citizens of other speech than the English, and especially with their clergy, whether Catholic or Protestant, an avowed hope and intention, through their influence in public schools, and still more in church schools, of which they have exclusive control, to perpetuate their foreign tongue, and to make it for all time the language of large portions of the country. To the dispassionate observer this hope is so wild that it seems incredible that it should be entertained by any man having the least acquaintance with our country. Yet it has been

avowed to me by a German clergyman of this city, who flattered himself that Great Britain and Ireland were almost exhausted as sources of emigration, while Germany, with her 45,000,000, would continue year after year to pour hundreds of thousands of her people on our shores. This insane hope is cherished chiefly in Wisconsin and in the Valley of the Northern Mississippi. The ears of American boys born of German parents are boxed by the religious teacher in parochial schools in St. Louis for the heinous offense of speaking the common language of America—the English—and a clerical superintendent, to reproach an American boy of German parents for manliness and independence, can find no better words to do justice to his reprobation than to say, “*Du bist ein Amerikaner*” (—You are an American!—) There is a widespread and persistent effort, with scarcely any attempt to conceal it, to Germanize the Catholic Church in the Northwest. The means toward the attainment of this is to multiply German church schools and German parishes, and to make the multiplication of the latter an excuse and a justification for the appointment, with the aid of German Cardinals in Rome, of German-speaking Bishops.

In furtherance of this plan, Germans speaking but imperfectly the English language are appointed pastors over English-speaking congregations, and especially where there is the excuse of the existence in the congregation of a few German-speaking families. This plan has been so successful that the ecclesiastical archiepiscopal province of Milwaukee, with its German archbishop and its German theological seminary, has been very largely Germanized, and similar designs for the immediate future are entertained for the great archbishoprics of Cincinnati and St. Louis. I may as well mention here, as not impertinent to the subject, that a German-American bishop who went to Washington to sound the Government upon the question of diplomatic relations with the Pope, expected, as his reward for the service, the archbishopric of St. Louis, which, it was hoped, would speedily become vacant by the death of the octogenarian, Kenrick.

The fact is, as has been stated by Professor Boyesen in a recent magazine article, urging restriction of immigration as a means of preserving our American nationality and institutions, that so great is now the spirit of foreign nationality among foreign-born citizens that many among them make no concealment of their

sense of superiority, and of their contempt of Americans, and of American manners and traditions. It can hardly be denied that in all this there is some danger in the way of the speedy assimilation of the peoples of various origins to one common American type. If the wishes and designs avowed by not a few of these foreign-born citizens were really practicable and likely to be realized, we might well brand them as guilty of constructive treason against our institutions and the best interests of our country; and there would be immensely greater occasion and excuse in all this for a display of rabid Know-Nothingism than there was for the great ebullition of antagonism to foreign-born citizens a generation ago. Yet, strange to say, what little we hear to-day of complaint is but a faint muttering compared to the former storm of denunciation and remonstrance. The two most conspicuous instances of recent date are the article just referred to, written by Professor Boyesen, himself a foreign-born citizen of but a few years' residence in our country, whose experience, as he tells us, has been chiefly with men of foreign speech—Scandinavians and Germans—and the utterances of Mr. Powderly, Master Workman of the Knights of Labor, who, if the same rule had been applied to his parents coming from Ireland that he would now apply to new-comers, might himself, as some one has said, be carrying turf, in an Irish bog, instead of being able, from the influential position he enjoys among Americans, to warn off later comers. There is surely as much room to-day in our widely increased territory as there was for his parents, and they are as likely to make worthy citizens and to be the progenitors of as worthy Americans, if this question of foreign immigration and its consequences be but treated with good sense and statesmanship. The object of Professor Boyesen seems to me a worthier one, and the danger he points out more real, while the object of Mr. Powderly is but a corollary, logical and consistent enough, from his standpoint, of that wretched business called "protection to American industry," which began by taxing and oppressing the whole American people to build up, by *quasi* monopolies, the fortunes of a privileged class of manufacturers and other producers. The too often deceived and robbed laboring classes have discovered that protection does not protect, and those of them, who still believe in the fetish of protection, now begin to deceive them-

selves with the false hope of protecting labor by making labor artificially scarce, and therefore by restraining the increase of population in a country so vast and so wonderfully supplied with all manner of good things that it would be able to hold and support the population of the whole world, and in which an average single State is as large and as well endowed as England, and needs only a population as large as that of England to make it as great in all respects. The wonder is that it has not occurred to these misguided workingmen to demand the abolition of the protection that does not protect, once they have discovered how badly they have been fooled, and to substitute in its stead a prohibitory, or at least an extremely high, protective tax upon the importation of men, and, for that matter, to be consistent, upon the birth of children.

Strange as is the mildness of the complaint of the new Know-Nothingism, compared with the old, in the protest against foreign immigration, and strangely unexpected as is the quarter from which the protest comes, stranger far is the mildness of toleration, or the indifference, and in innumerable cases the actual approval by Americans, especially by those of them that are represented in the public press, of the attitude of the churches, and especially of the Roman Catholic Church, towards our Government, our laws, our American principles, traditions and institutions. Now that the number of foreign-born inhabitants, and still more the number of Catholics, is in a much larger proportion to the total population, we hear nothing like the former frantic cries of alarm from the native-born and the Protestant. And yet things have been happening within the last few years all over the country, and especially in our State and City of New York, a mere tithe of which would, but a generation ago, have stirred the country to a white heat of anger.

But a few years ago, many bishops, assembled in the provincial council of Cincinnati, issued a pastoral letter, the product of the pen of the Scotch bishop Gilmour, of Cleveland, which was largely a deliberate thesis against our Declaration of Independence, in the attempt to show that men are not born "free and equal," and when some remonstrance was called forth, in not a few instances from Catholics, the Franco-American bishop, Chatard, of Indianapolis, hastened to justify the manifesto, which he had himself signed, in a letter to a New York paper, in which he corroborated

the teaching of the pastoral letter by quotations from a letter of the Pope, whom he slavishly described as "our present holy father, Pope Leo XIII., now gloriously reigning." The new generation of bishops is by no means so averse as were their predecessors to having their ears tickled by the grateful appellations of "lord" and "lordship," and nothing is now more common than to speak of and to address an archbishop by the ducal sobriquet of "his grace" and "your grace." The bishops, in great majority, are now eager to obtrude their professional rank on the public by the use of a distinctive garb, wearing about their necks the imperial purple, with which, as well as with wealth and power, the first Christian emperors began the corruption of the Church. And they force the priests to wear, in public as well as in private, a professional badge known as the Roman collar, of which an old American priest, some years ago, hearing of the desire of his bishop that the priests should always wear it, said, with bitterness, "I suppose the next thing will be that we must have the bishop's name written upon the collar."

Thirty-five years ago it was extremely rare to hear from bishops and priests the denunciations, now so common, of the public schools, which, in spite of the hackneyed character of the phrase, have well been called, and may for all time to come well be called, the palladium of our liberties, and the safeguard of American institutions. The late James A. McMaster, editor of the *Freeman's Journal*, well-known for his rabid hatred of the public schools, stated in his paper that at the time of the First Plenary Council of Baltimore, only one venerated prelate and himself took the correct view of the school question. From this we can gather that the other bishops did not then see in the public school system the horrors that their successors almost unanimously discover. This is also shown by the language of the earlier councils of Baltimore, in which, speaking of the public schools, they have nothing to say of the "godlessness," the "wantonness," and the "immoralities" of these schools, of which things we have in late years heard so much from bishops and priests, and their journalistic organs. One of these earlier utterances, incorporated in paragraphs 428 and 429 of the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, shows that so far was it then from being the desire of the bishops (while complaining of certain inequalities to which Catholics were subjected in the schools) to restrain Catholic children from going



to the public schools, that they made it the duty of pastors to take an interest in the schools, and to secure in them the rights of conscience of Catholic children. The words of the Council are :

“ Since often in books in use in the schools there are things which are hostile to our faith, and which place our doctrines in a false light, and distort history, the welfare of religion, the right education of youth and the honor of our country demand a remedy for so great an evil. As it is certain that in most of the States public education is so conducted that it is made to serve the interests of the sects, so that the minds of Catholic children are gradually imbued with their principles, we admonish pastors that they should spare no pains in looking to the Christian and Catholic education of children, and should watch diligently to prevent their using the Protestant Bibles and reciting and singing the prayers of the sects. Therefore, they should be vigilant in guarding against the introduction of such books and exercises into the public schools. They should everywhere resist these sectarian efforts with constancy and moderation, and endeavor to obtain the necessary remedy from the authorities.”

Contrast the moderation of this language, and this inculcation of moderation upon the priests, with the violent denunciations and gross calumnies of later days. There is now an avowed determination, as shown in the last Council of Baltimore, to establish all over the country a great system of parochial schools in opposition to the public schools, and it is made the most urgent duty of priests everywhere, under threat of expulsion, to found such schools. The hope is not concealed that, when the so-called “Catholic vote” shall become larger, the politicians may be induced to appropriate, through State legislatures or local governments, all the funds necessary for the support of these schools. This has already been accomplished in Poughkeepsie, New Haven, and elsewhere, and for a brief period during the offensive and defensive alliance between a certain set of priests and the Tammany ring of the days of Tweed, Connolly, and Sweeney, an appropriation procured by legislative trick and fraud, under the management of Peter B. Sweeney, awarded several hundred thousand dollars to the parochial schools of New York City. What would the old-time Know-Nothings have thought of this? It should be noted that these parochial schools, which it is the design to multiply, are exempt from taxation, and that thus the public in some sense puts a premium upon a system of schools hostile to its own, and so encourages the laying of an enormous additional burden upon the poor Catholic people who have already paid, directly or indirectly, their full share of the taxes for the support of the public schools, which it is now the grow-

ing tendency to forbid them to use, under penalty of privation of the sacraments of the church. Another thing which was almost unheard of a generation ago, and the suggestion of which, in anything like its present extent, would then have caused the gravest civil disturbances, is the appropriation of valuable public lands and of millions of dollars of public money, to the support of all manner of sectarian institutions under the control of churches, and especially of the Roman Catholic Church. It may be sufficient, by way of illustration, to refer to the Catholic Protectory, in Westchester, to the House of the Sisters of Mercy in 81st street, and to the Foundling Asylum of the Sisters of Charity in 68th street, immense institutions supported by the city treasury of New York, at an expense of from half a million to a million of dollars a year, and the two latter built upon blocks of ground given by the city through the favor of the Tammany ring, and worth hundreds of thousands each. There is a host of smaller institutions of the same character, and supported chiefly by the public treasury, to nearly all of which children are committed as to public institutions by the civil magistrates. Would it not be enough to make the elder Know-Nothing bigots turn in their graves could they hear that vast sums and great public properties are thus turned over to irresponsible private and sectarian institutions, especially if they could learn that the priests, and monks, and nuns, whose institutions are thus benefited by the public, are but the more emboldened to denounce our schools and other public institutions, in language at times brutal if not obscene, while indulging in unwarranted pharisaic glorification of their own institutions and of themselves. The extraordinary zeal manifested for the getting up of these sectarian schools and institutions is, first of all, prompted by jealousy and rivalry of our public schools and institutions, and by the desire to keep children and other beneficiaries from the latter, and, secondly, by the desire to make employment for and give comfortable homes to the rapidly increasing hosts of monks and nuns, who make so-called education and so-called charity their regular business, for which a very common experience shows that they have but little qualification beyond their professional stamp and garb.

It is not risking much to say that if there were no public schools there would be very few parochial schools, and the Catholic children, for all the churchmen would do for them, would

grow up in brutish ignorance of letters; and a commonplace of churchmen here would be the doctrine taught by the Jesuits in Italy, in their periodical magazine, the *Civiltà Cattolica*, that the people do not need to learn to read, that all they do need is bread and the catechism, the latter of which they could manage to know something of, even without knowing how to read. A confirmation of this is to be found in the very general illiteracy in countries where churches and churchmen have been exceedingly abundant and have exercised temporal control. It is a remarkable fact, that in Italy, France, and other so-called Catholic countries, in spite of the hostility to the government schools, the clergy do not establish parochial schools. The ecclesiastical authorities of Italy, while willing enough to impose on our Catholic people of America so heavy a burden, do not dare to try to impose a similar burden upon their people nearer home. But what, most of all, might seem well adapted to revive and intensify the old hateful and bigoted spirit of Know-Nothingism, and justify its fears and predictions, is the actual and direct interference in politics of bishops, vicars-general, and priests in their ecclesiastical capacity and because of their ecclesiastical influence, to promote the pecuniary and other temporal objects of the ecclesiastical machine.

Recent instances of this, not a few, could be mentioned. It must suffice here merely to refer to the letters and messages of the late Vicar-General Quinn, of New York, sent to clergymen to secure their influence as churchmen to defeat constitutional amendments which, even after their adoption, have been practically over-ridden and over-ruled in the interest of Catholic institutions, and to secure the election to the Legislature of such men as Mr. J. W. Husted, because he was willing to favor "generous appropriations;" the instance referred to in this article of the clerical alliance with the Tweed ring; the letter of Monsignor Preston to Joseph O'Donoghue in the late Mayoralty canvass; the denunciation of one of the candidates and his party from Catholic altars; the secret prohibition to a priest, who went not as a priest, but as a citizen, to keep his engagement to speak at a political meeting, the chief demerit of which speech was clearly in the fact that the movement it was intended to help was likely to bring disaster upon the Tammany ally of the ecclesiastical machine; the abuse of the confessional in forbidding men under penalty of refusal of absolution

to attend the meetings of one political party ; and last and worst of all, the effort, of an archbishop in the late election, to defeat at the polls by the abuse of his ecclesiastical position the call for a constitutional convention, which, as the result proved, was demanded by an overwhelming majority of all those who voted on the question—an effort in full keeping with the action of the same archbishop, when bishop of Newark, in sending to the Catholic pastors of New Jersey a secret confidential letter, telling them to “instruct” their people how they “must” vote upon certain proposed constitutional amendments, giving minute details as to the striking out of certain clauses, and suggesting that for greater surety it might be better that the Catholic voters should strike out all the clauses. The heinousness of this action will be better understood when it is mentioned that the object of the proposed amendments was to protect the public treasury, and to prevent the people of counties and towns from being oppressed and robbed by railroad and other corporations.

From this cursory review of the situation, then and now, it would seem that the fear of the things, the alleged evils and dangers of which were dreaded, predicted, and denounced with so much vehemence by the elder Know-Nothings, would find to-day a hundredfold greater justification. And yet we witness the extraordinary spectacle of the indifference of the old political parties to the danger, and their actual co-operation in bringing about this state of things through legislative action. A similar indifference, where there is not positive acquiescence or co-operation, is to be noticed in the great majority of the journals of the country. The reason of this is not hard to find. It is actually the fulfillment of the prevision of those who saw in the growth of a vast army of foreign-born voters likely to be swayed as one man by other than American objects and considerations, and in the growth of an ecclesiastical power, secret and despotic in its methods, and owing, it was alleged, blind obedience to a foreign potentate, a real danger to the unity and distinctive characteristics of our nationality, and to the liberties and institutions of our country. The old political parties, and the newspaper press, which is mostly devoted to one or the other of them, are now so much impressed with the importance of the Catholic vote, and the adopted citizens’ vote, that they will not run the risk of alienating either, by shocking even the most un-

reasonable and un-American prejudices. But those most active as political leaders and partisans, and those whose opinions get the most airing in the press, are not the most nor the best of the people of either party. We hear whisperings and mutterings here and there that portend the speedy crystallization and emphatic enunciation of an American public opinion which, while free from the vulgar theological hatred and low-minded jealousy against foreign-born citizens that characterized the elder Know-Nothingism, will have something more effectual to propose as a remedy for the grave evils we have pointed out than the ridiculously inadequate and selfish new Know-Nothingism of restricting immigration, as proposed by Prof. Boyesen and Mr. Powderly.

I do not think that the party that shall adopt this crystallized opinion into its platform will be open to the charge of Know-Nothingism, whether of the earlier and more virulent, or of the later and weaker sort, and I venture to predict that this view of the situation and of the remedy will be adopted by the Labor party now forming—a giant, though yet in its infancy—which is adhered to by citizens of foreign birth and by men of Catholic faith as largely and probably more largely than is either of the old political parties. The remedy must not be one that shall create an artificial scarcity of population in a land that is crying out for hundreds of millions to come and occupy it and to produce untold wealth by their labor. The remedy must not consist in any measure that shall abridge the religious liberties or interfere with the rights of conscience of any man. It must substantially consist in securing to all men the largest liberty compatible with the liberties and rights of others, and therefore in granting absolute equal justice to all, and never the slightest privilege or favor to any. On such lines as these, and only on such lines, can be perpetuated one magnificent American nationality, covering a whole continent, speaking one language, enjoying equal laws, its members living together in perfect peace and fraternity, and accomplishing for humanity greater wonders of civilization than the world has yet ventured to hope for. These lines are not new lines, but old and safe ones, marked out by Jefferson and the other seers and sages to whom we owe the Great Declaration and the foundations of our government—they are :

Respect for the rights of conscience ;

Separation of Church and State in that sense which is really

the best union of Church and State, namely, the perfect respect of each for the rights of the other, and a perpetual abstinence from interference by either in the affairs of the other ;

The making of our country for all time to come what it has been in the past, a beacon of liberty and a refuge to the oppressed of all the nations of the world ;

The abolishing of all privileges granted by public authority to individuals or corporations, whether civil or religious, and the equal taxation of the property of all such corporations, without exemption or exception in favor of any church, charity or school, or, in a word, of any institution that is not the property of the people and controlled for some public and common use by public officials ; and the conduct of government, in all things, absolutely for the public, that is the common, good—or, in other words, for the masses, and never for an individual or a class.

Thus, only common schools and common charities should be supported from the common treasury. Only the common language of the country should be taught in the common schools. The values that have been given to land by the growth of the community should be restored to the community by the payment, in the form of a tax, of a perfect equivalent ; while all the taxes that are now levied upon the production, exchange or accumulation of wealth—all the taxes, that now repress industry and add to the cost of living, should be abolished. And the privileges and franchises that have been granted by the community to individuals or to corporations should be either terminated by the sovereign community—as all our jurisprudence teaches that they may be—or the possessors thereof should likewise pay to the community a perfect equivalent. When perfect justice shall thus be done the old wondrous charm and vigor will be more than restored to our American nationality, and the rapid decline of American patriotism which Professor Boyesen observes and deplors in our foreign-born citizens, and contrasts with the sentiments of a similar class as late even as fifteen years ago, will speedily cease, and the foreign-born citizen, enjoying equal access to the bounties of nature, and therefore able as never before to procure wealth and to assert and develop his manhood, contrasting his present condition with that of his European home will, in his keener appreciation and thankfulness, as of old, rival in American patriotism the elder American stock.

Some not well-informed reader of this article may imagine that these views are new to the writer, or that I may never before have thought it expedient to publish them. It may not therefore be amiss to reproduce in concluding this article a series of suggestions looking towards "an act (or amendment to the Constitution) to guard against the union of church and state and to protect liberty of conscience," published by me in the *New York Sun* of April 30, 1870, as follows :

- "1. Forbidding appropriations of school funds to any but common schools.
- "2. Forbidding the reading of the Bible or any other distinctively religious book ; all praying, worship, and singing of religious hymns in common schools.
- "3. Forbidding magistrates to commit to any but public prisons, asylums, etc.
- "4. Repealing all existing laws by which appropriations are made to any but public institutions, and forbidding (legislature) counties, cities, towns, and villages, to donate any property, or to sell or lease it at lower than market values, or to donate money for the payment of assessments, or for any other purpose, to any church, or to any school, college, asylum, hospital, etc., or to any institution of charity, correction, or learning, which is not the property of the people, and under the exclusive control of officers of the people.
- "5. Revoking existing appointments, and forbidding future appointments of chaplains, whether salaried or not, in any public institution, and forbidding compulsory attendance at, or joining in, any prayer, worship, or religious service or instruction in any public institution, and forbidding any insult to the faith or religious convictions of any inmates of public institutions, or pupils in public schools.
- "6. Granting all reasonable facilities to citizens and clergymen of all denominations, to visit public institutions of charity and correction, to impart religious instruction or consolation, or administer religious ordinances to those of their own faith or those who may freely desire it."

EDWARD MCGLYNN.